

Remarks

Claims 31-42, 48 and 51-56 were pending in the Application prior to the outstanding Office Action. In the Office Action, the Examiner allowed claims 31-42 and 48, rejected claims 51-53, and objected to claims 54-56 solely as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. The present Response makes no changes to the claims, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration claims 51-53. Reconsideration of the rejections is requested.

I. DRAWINGS OBJECTION

The Examiner has again objected to Applicants' drawings on the ground the Figs. 1-7 should be designated "Prior Art".

Applicants respectfully do not understand this objection, since in response to a previous identical objection, they have already submitted Formal Drawings that include the "Prior Art" designation on these figures.

In fact, Applicants are certain that these formal drawings are still in the PTO's file, since they have been scanned by the PTO into the Image File Wrapper and are currently available for download on PAIR.

If the Examiner still believes Applicants' Formal Drawings remain insufficient in any way, it is respectfully requested that the undersigned be contacted by telephone to explain the problem. Applicants will readily correct any drawing problem that truly exists.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that any drawing objection has been overcome.

II. ART REJECTIONS

The Examiner rejected claims 51-53 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by McClintock. In McClintock's Fig. 2 and the cited description at col. 7, lines 19-25, he refers to certain programmable interconnections as being "1/4 populated", "1/2 populated" or "fully populated".

A. Independent Claim 51

Claim 51 recites a "programmable logic array (PLA) having a depopulated array that includes programmable connections only where required to implement certain known functionality." As mentioned in Applicants' April 2, 2003 Response, in the present application, "depopulation" refers to removing programmable connections (¶ 38). In other words, "depopulation", as used in the present application, involves starting with some quantity of programmable connections of a PLA and then *removing* some of them.

Nothing in McClintock teaches starting with some quantity of programmable interconnections and then *removing* some of them. So far as Applicants can determine, McClintock's devices are designed from the beginning to contain only the specific programmable interconnects that will exist in the final programmable product.

Certain groups of intersections between horizontal and vertical conductors in McClintock's devices are not programmable for electrical interconnection, and in that sense not all of his intersections are "populated" with programmable interconnections. But there is nothing in McClintock that teaches or suggests that any "depopulation" occurred in order to create such partially "populated" intersections.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that McClintock fails to teach an element of Applicants' claim 51, and therefore cannot anticipate. Accordingly, claim 51 should be patentable.

B. Dependent Claims 52-53

Dependent claims 52-53 each depend from independent claim 51 and therefore are believed to be patentable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 51. In addition, these claims each add their own limitations which, it is submitted, render them patentable in their own right.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 52-53 should be patentable as well.

III. ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Claims 31-42 and 48 have been allowed.

Claims 54-56 were objected to solely as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, claim 51. Since claim 51 is now believed to be patentable, it is respectfully submitted that claims 54-56 should be patentable as well.

IV. CONCLUSION

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested. The

Attorney Docket No. LGHT 1047-0

Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

Enclosed is a PETITION FOR REVIVAL OF AN APPLICATION FOR PATENT ABANDONED UNINTENTIONALLY UNDER 37 CFR 1.137(b).

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0869 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 7/9/2004

By:



Warren S. Wolfeld, Reg. No. 31,454

Haynes Beffel & Wolfeld LLP
P.O. Box 366
Half Moon Bay, CA 94019
(650) 712-0340 phone
(650) 712-0263 fax